arXiv:1704.03389v1 [math.RT] 11 Apr 2017

# Adams operations and symmetries of representation categories

Ehud Meir and Markus Szymik

April 2017

Adams operations are the natural transformations of the representation ring functor on the category of finite groups, and they are one way to codify the usual λ–ring structure on these rings. From the representation theoretic point of view, they encode some of the symmetric monoidal structure of the representation category. We show that the monoidal structure on the category alone, regardless of the particular symmetry, determines all the odd Adams operations. We also give examples of two different symmetries for the same monoidal structure which produce two different second Adams operations. Along the way, we classify all possible symmetries and all monoidal auto-equivalences of representation categories of finite groups.

MSC: 18D10, 19A22, 20C15.

Keywords: Representation rings, Adams operations, λ–rings, symmetric monoidal categories

## Introduction

Groups describe symmetries, and it is therefore not a surprise that they are studied using their actions. Linear algebra can be exploited for the purposes of group theory by considering linear actions, or representations. This raises the question:

To what extent are groups determined by their representation theory? The answer depends, of course, on the way the question is specified.

A basic and fundamental invariant of a finite group $G$ is its representation ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$. The underlying abelian group is free on the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible representations of the group $G$, the addition is given by the direct sum, and the multiplication is given by the tensor product. As a fact of life, this is far from being a complete invariant for the group $G$: There are finite groups that are not isomorphic but have isomorphic representation rings. For instance, the dihedral group $\mathrm{D}_8$ and the quaternion group $\mathrm{Q}_8$ of order 8 have isomorphic representation rings. The problem here is that the representation rings $\mathrm{R}(G)$ only see the objects up to isomorphism, but otherwise ignore the delicate interaction of the group actions on and the isomorphisms between the representations.

The Adams operations $\Psi^n$ turn the representation rings $\mathrm{R}(G)$ into $\lambda$–rings. See Section 1 for a brief review. It can be shown that the representation rings of the groups $\mathrm{D}_8$ and $\mathrm{Q}_8$ are not isomorphic as $\lambda$–rings. However, there are also examples (due to Dade [Dad64]) of non-isomorphic finite groups (of order $5^7 = 78125$ and more) with isomorphic representation rings as $\lambda$–rings. These examples are particularly simple from the point of view of the Adams operations because they are $p$–groups of exponent $p$. This implies that the $p$–th Adams opertion $\Psi^p$ is trivial, and the other Adams operations $\Psi^\ell$ for $\ell$ prime to $p$ are given by Galois actions, regardless of the group. (Dade distinguishes these groups by means of their Lie rings.) It follows that the representation ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$, even when considered as a $\lambda$–ring, gives us only partial information about the group $G$, and the hope is that categorification gives us a bigger and better picture.

There is a precise sense in which a finite group $G$ is actually determined by its representation theory: By a theorem of Deligne, the category $\mathbf{Rep}(G)$ of finite-dimensional representations determines the group $G$ up to isomorphism if the former is considered as a symmetric monoidal category. See the original sources [DM82, Prop. 1.8 on p. 129], [Del90], and Breen's exposition in [Bre94], for instance. This implies, in particular, that the representation categories $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathrm{D}_8)$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathrm{Q}_8)$ are not equivalent as symmetric monoidal categories, and that the representation categories can also tell Dade's examples apart. Actually, in these cases, the representation categories are not even equivalent as

monoidal categories. Still, for Deligne's theorem, the symmetry is important: It is known from the work of Etingof and Gelaki that there are groups $G$ and $G'$ that are not isomorphic but such that their representation categories $\mathbf{Rep}(G)$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(G')$ are equivalent as monoidal categories. See [EG01] for these *isocategorical* groups. In [GM] it is shown that for isocategorical pairs of groups the Witt groups of their representation categories are isomorphic.

In this paper, we investigate how far the Adams operations on the representation ring allow us to recover the canonical symmetry on the monoidal representation category of a finite group, and hence the group. We review the Adams operations and give a characterization of them in Proposition 1.1 as the natural transformations of the representation ring functor, and offer a representation theoretic description in Proposition 1.3. This nicely complements the usual formula on the level of characters. In Section 2 we review the Etingof–Gelaki classification of isocategorical groups. Building on that, we describe the possible symmetries on the monoidal representation categories $\mathbf{Rep}(G)$ in Theorem 3.1 and the monoidal auto-equivalences $\mathbf{Rep}(G) \to \mathbf{Rep}(G)$ in Theorem 3.2.

Our main result appears as Theorem 4.1 in the text:

**Theorem.** *If $G$ and $G'$ are two isocategorical groups, and $\mathbf{Rep}(G) \to \mathbf{Rep}(G')$ is a monoidal equivalence between their representation categories, then the induced isomorphism $\mathrm{R}(G) \cong \mathrm{R}(G')$ between their representation rings preserves the Adams operations $\Psi^p$ for all odd $p$.*

This shows that the odd Adams operations do not carry additional information on the symmetry. In Example 5.1 we show that this result is the best possible: There is a non-symmetric monoidal equivalence $\mathbf{Rep}(G) \to \mathbf{Rep}(G')$ that does not preserve the second Adams operations $\Psi^2$. One might then wonder if the additional preservation of the second Adams operation $\Psi^2$ is enough to ensure that we have a symmetric monoidal equivalence, but we show in Example 5.2 that this is also not the case. However, in all our examples the groups are isomorphic. This raises the question: Suppose that $G$ and $G'$ are isocategorical groups, and assume that the induced isomorphism $\mathrm{R}(G) \cong \mathrm{R}(G')$ of representation rings arising from a monoidal equivalence $F\colon \mathbf{Rep}(G) \to \mathbf{Rep}(G')$ of representation categories preserves (not only the odd Adams operations but also) the second Adams opera-

tion $\Psi^2$. Do the groups $G$ and $G'$ have to be isomorphic? As mentioned above, it is possible that the functor $F$ itself is not symmetric; but it turned out that the categories $\mathbf{Rep}(G)$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(G')$ can be related by another functor which is symmetric in all examples that we know of.

## Notation and conventions

Throughout this paper we fix a field $K$ that is algebraically closed and of characteristic zero. For any finite group $G$, we will denote by $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ the category of finite-dimensional $G$–representations over $K$. This is more precise than the notation $\mathbf{Rep}(G)$ that we have used for the purposes of the introduction only. More generally, we will use the notation $\mathbf{Rep}(H)$ for the category of finite-dimensional representations of a finite-dimensional Hopf algebra $H$ over $K$. These representation categories have a canonical structure of a rigid monoidal category. (Rigidity means that each object admits a dual object.) In addition, these representation categories admit a canonical symmetric monoidal structure: For every two objects $V,W$ in $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ we have a natural isomorphism $\sigma_{V,W}: V\otimes W \to W\otimes V$ given by $v\otimes w \mapsto w\otimes v$. This isomorphism satisfies $\sigma_{V,W}\sigma_{W,V} = \mathrm{id}$. Our analysis of the Adams operations later will lead us to study other symmetric monoidal structures on $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ as well.

We will denote by $\mathrm{R}(G)$ the Grothendieck ring $\mathrm{K}_0\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ of the monoidal category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$. This is the representation ring of the group $G$, and (by our assumptions on the field $K$) independent of our particular choice, as the notation suggests. It has a canonical $\mathbb{Z}$–basis given by the irreducible representations $\chi_1,\dots,\chi_r$ of $G$. It can be identified with a subring of the ring of class functions on $G$ by means of the character map that sends a representation $V$ to its character $\chi_V: g\mapsto \mathrm{tr}(g\,|\,V)$.

# 1 Representation rings and power operations

In this section we describe the Adams operations as the natural transformations of the representation ring functor on the category of finite groups. They are an

equivalent way of encoding the well-known λ–ring structure. We also give an interpretation in terms of the representation category, and explain how to determine the order and the exponent of any finite group from them.

## 1.1 Representation rings as λ–rings

The notion of a λ–ring first arose in Grothendieck's work [Gro58, 4.2] on vector bundles and K-theory. Nowadays, it is recognized that λ–operations are a useful additional structure that is present in many other contexts. See [AT69] and [Ben84] for representation theory. There are many ways to present the algebraic theory of λ–rings. See Berthelot's chapter [Ber71] in SGA 6 as well as [Knu73], [Pat03], and the recent book [Yau10] by Yau. For the purposes of the present text, it is only important to know about Wilkerson's criterion [Wil82]: If a ring is torsion-free as an abelian group, then a λ–ring structure on it is equivalent to a family $(\Psi^n \,|\, n \in \mathbb{Z})$ of commuting ring endomorphisms that satisfy $\Psi^{mn} = \Psi^m \Psi^n$ and such that $\Psi^p$ is a Frobenius lift for each prime number $p$. In particular, since representation rings are torsion-free, their λ–ring structure is determined by the Adams operations on them and vice versa.

For a natural number $k$ and a representation $V$ of a finite group $G$, the λ–operations on the representation ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$ are defined using the exterior powers: we have $\lambda^k[V] = [\Lambda^k V]$. Notice that this definition relies on the usual symmetric monoidal structure on the representation category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$. The corresponding Adams operations are defined on the level of class functions by the formula $\Psi^k_G(\chi)(g) = \chi(g^k)$. In case the group $G$ is clear from the context, we will write $\Psi^k_G = \Psi^k$. Notice that for every $k$ and every character $\chi$ it holds that $\Psi^k(\chi)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$–linear combination of the irreducible characters. This is not clear just from the definition of the Adams operations. It follows from the fact that they correspond to the aforementioned λ–operations. See [Ser67, Ex. 9.3.b], for instance.

Notice that the $k$–th Adams operation $\Psi^k$ depends only the class of $k$ modulo the exponent of $G$, and therefore can be defined for all $k$ in the pro-finite completion $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ of the group $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers.

The family $(\Psi^k_G \,|\, G)$ defines a natural endomorphism $\Psi^k\colon \mathrm{R} \to \mathrm{R}$ of the representation ring functor R, thought of as a contravariant functor from the category of finite groups and (all) homomorphisms to the category of (commutative) rings (with unit): Restriction along a group homomorphism $G \to G'$ defines a ring homomorphism $\mathrm{R}(G') \to \mathrm{R}(G)$. In fact, it is easy to see that this leads to a characterization of the Adams operations:

**Proposition 1.1.** *The monoid of endomorphisms of the representation ring functor is isomorphic to the multiplicative monoid of pro-finite integers $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$. The pro-finite integer $k$ corresponds to the $k$–th Adams operation $\Psi^k$.*

The idea for a proof is very simple: The group $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers under addition generates the category of groups (in the sense that it represents the forgetful functor to sets) and we could detect every natural transformation on this single example. But the group $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers is not finite, and we have to replace it by the family of its finite quotients, the finite cyclic groups:

*Proof.* Let us first see that that every natural transformation $\Phi$ has the form $\Psi^k$ for some pro-finite integer $k$. Since the restrictions to cyclic subgroups induce an injection

$$\mathrm{R}(G) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{C \leqslant G \\ \text{cyclic}}} \mathrm{R}(C),$$

the natural transformation $\Phi$ is determined by its behavior on cyclic groups. For a cyclic group $C$ of order $n$, the representation ring $\mathrm{R}(C)$ is isomorphic to the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[C^\vee]$ of the character group $C^\vee$. This is generated (as a ring) by any embedding $\gamma\colon C \to K^\times$ of groups (and it holds that $\gamma^n = 1$). Then $\Phi(\gamma)$ is also a unit that is torsion. By Higman's theorem [Hig40, Thm. 3], for instance, every unit of $\mathbb{Z}[C^\vee]$ that is torsion is trivial in Whitehead's sense: We have $\Phi(\gamma) = \pm\gamma^{k_n}$ for some integer $k_n$. The restriction to the trivial subgroup shows that $\Phi$ preserves the augmentation $\mathrm{R}(G) \to \mathbb{Z}$ of the representation ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$ given by the dimension, so that the sign has to be positive, and $\Phi_C = \Psi^{k_n}_C$ for all cyclic groups $C$ of order $n$. Restriction to subgroups shows that $k_n$ is congruent to $k_m$ modulo $m$ whenever $m$ divides $n$, so that the family $(k_n \in \mathbb{Z}/n \,|\, n \geqslant 1)$ describes a pro-finite integer $k$ such that $\Phi_C = \Psi^k_C$ for all cyclic groups $C$. As mentioned at the beginning, the

equation $\Phi_G = \Psi^k_G$ for all groups $G$ follows. Conversely, this argument also shows how to read off $k$ from $\Psi^k$. □

## 1.2 A representation theoretic interpretation

We will now explain how to find a nice expression for a matrix that describes the $k$–th Adams operation $\Psi^k\colon \mathrm{R}(G) \to \mathrm{R}(G)$ on the representation ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$ of a finite group $G$. To do so we write as before $\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r$ for the irreducible characters of the group $G$, and write the class function $\Psi^k(\chi_i)\colon g \mapsto \chi_i(g^k)$ as a linear combination

$$\Psi^k(\chi_i) = \sum_j \Psi^k_{i,j}\chi_j$$

of the irreducible characters. This gives the matrix $(\,\Psi^k_{i,j}\,|\,1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant r\,)$ of $\Psi^k$ with respect to the chosen basis—at least in theory. The scalars $\Psi^k_{i,j}$ can be computed directly, using representation theory, as follows.

We have the standard inner product

$$\langle\,\alpha\,|\,\beta\,\rangle = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_g \overline{\alpha(g)}\beta(g) \tag{1.1}$$

for class functions. The irreducible characters form an orthogonal basis, so that we can compute

$$\Psi^k_{i,j} = \langle\,\chi_j\,|\,\Psi^k(\chi_i)\,\rangle = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_g \chi_j(g^{-1})\chi_i(g^k). \tag{1.2}$$

Let $V_i$ be an irreducible representation that corresponds to the irreducible character $\chi_i$. Equation (1.2) shows that $\Psi^k_{1,j}$ is the $k$–th Frobenius–Schur indicator of $V_j$. Let $\sigma_k$ be the linear operator on the $k$–th tensor power $V_i^{\otimes k}$ that cyclically permutes the factors. Since this is $KG$–linear, we have an induced map $(\sigma_k)_*$ on the space $\mathrm{Hom}_G(V_j, V_i^{\otimes k})$ by post-composition. In order to describe $\Psi^k_{i,j}$ explicitly, we need the following lemma, whose proof can be found in [KSZ06, Sec. 2.3]:

**Lemma 1.2.** *Given any $K$–vector space $V$ together with $K$–linear endomorphisms $f_1, \ldots, f_k\colon V \to V$, and $\sigma_k\colon V^{\otimes k} \to V^{\otimes k}$ denotes the cyclic permutation,*

*then we have an equality*

$$\mathrm{tr}(\,\sigma_k(f_1\otimes f_2\otimes\cdots\otimes f_k)\,|\,V^{\otimes k}\,)=\mathrm{tr}(\,f_1f_2\cdots f_k\,|\,V\,)$$

*of traces.*

**Proposition 1.3.** *Let $V_1,\ldots,V_r$ be representatives of the isomorphism classes of irreducible $G$–representations of a finite group $G$. Then we have*

$$\Psi^k(V_i)=\sum_{j=1}^{r}\mathrm{tr}\left(\,\sigma_k^*\,|\,\mathrm{Hom}_G(V_j,V_i^{\otimes k})\,\right)V_j$$

*in the representation ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$, where $\sigma_k$ is the cyclic permutation of the tensor factors of $V_i^{\otimes k}$.*

*Proof.* Consider the vector space $W=\mathrm{Hom}_G(V_j,V_i^{\otimes k})$. Notice first that $W$ is the subspace of $G$–invariants in the representation $U=\mathrm{Hom}(V_j,V_i^{\otimes k})$ where the action of the group $G$ is the usual diagonal action. Also, the $G$–representation $U$ is naturally isomorphic with $V_j^*\otimes V_i^{\otimes k}$. The projection $U\to W$ is given by the action of the idempotent $\epsilon=|G|^{-1}\sum_{g\in G}g$. The operator $\sigma^*$ commutes with the action of $\epsilon$, and we have $\mathrm{tr}(\,\sigma^*\,|\,W\,)=\mathrm{tr}(\,\epsilon\sigma^*\,|\,U\,)$. This is in fact true whenever we have an operator commuting with a projection. As in Lemma 1.2 we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}(\,\sigma^*\,|\,W\,)&=\mathrm{tr}(\,\epsilon\sigma^*\,|\,U\,)\\&=\mathrm{tr}\left(\,\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}g\otimes g^k\,|\,V_j^*\otimes V_i\,\right)\\&=\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\chi_j(g^{-1})\chi_i(g^k)\\&=\Psi_{i,j}^k\end{aligned}$$

to finish the proof. □

**Remark 1.4.** We have shown that $\Psi_{i,j}^k$ is the character value of a $k$–cycle for some representation of the permutation group $\mathrm{S}_k$. This makes it also clear that the coefficients $\Psi_{i,j}^k$ are integers: All irreducible representations of $\mathrm{S}_k$ are already realizable over the prime field $\mathbb{Q}$, and character values are always algebraic and contained in the field of definition.

## 1.3 Order and exponent

Recall that the rank of the representation ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$ (as an abelian group) is the number of conjugacy classes of elements in $G$, so that this numerical invariant of $G$ is determined by it.

**Proposition 1.5.** *The* $\lambda$*–ring structure on the representation ring* $\mathrm{R}(G)$ *determines the exponent of* $G$*.*

*Proof.* Let $e = \exp(G)$ be the exponent of $G$. Then $g^{k+e} = g^k$ for all elements $g$ of $G$, so that we have $\Psi^{k+e} = \Psi^k$ for all integers $k$. This shows that the family $\Psi = (\Psi^k \,|\, k \in \mathbb{Z})$ is periodic, and we claim that $e$ is its period.

We can use that $\Psi^0 = \dim$ is the dimension function $\mathrm{R}(G) \to \mathbb{Z} \to \mathrm{R}(G)$. Assume that we have $\Psi^{k+f} = \Psi^k$ for all integers $k$. If $\rho$ denotes the character of the regular representation, then $\Psi^f(\rho) = \Psi^0(\rho) = \dim(\rho)$ is constant and equals the order of $G$. But, on the other hand, we have $(\Psi^f \rho)(g) = \rho(g^f)$. Since the character of the regular representation vanishes away from the neutral element of $G$, we deduce $g^f$ is the neutral element of the group $G$ for all $g$ so that $f$ is a multiple of the exponent of $G$, as claimed. □

**Remark 1.6.** It follows from Shimizu's work [Shi10] that isocategorical groups have the same exponent. This shows that the exponent is an invariant which is also computable from the monoidal category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ alone, not using its symmetry. It is arguably much easier to use the $\lambda$–ring structure on $\mathrm{R}(G)$, though.

The following result should be well known.

**Proposition 1.7.** *The representation ring* $\mathrm{R}(G)$ *determines the order of* $G$*.*

*Proof.* We can identify $\mathrm{R}(G)$ with a subring of the ring $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{R}(G)$ and think of this as the ring of complex class functions on $G$. The primitive central idempotents in $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{R}(G)$ are the characteristic functions of the conjugacy classes. Let us write $\epsilon_g$ for the one corresponding to the conjugacy class of the element $g$. The inner product (1.1) evaluates to

$$\langle \chi_j \,|\, \epsilon_g \rangle = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_h \chi_j(h^{-1}) \epsilon_g(h),$$

which is $\chi_j(g^{-1})/|G|$ times the number of conjugates of $g$ in $G$, or $|G/\mathrm{C}_G(s)|$. Since the irreducible characters form an orthonormal basis, we get the formula

$$\epsilon_g = \frac{1}{|\mathrm{C}_G(g)|}\sum_j \chi_j(g^{-1})\chi_j.$$

For instance, we have $\epsilon_1 = \rho/|G|$. In general, the coefficient of the trivial representation is $1/|\mathrm{C}_G(g)|$. Let $n_g$ be the minimal positive integer such that $n_g\epsilon_g$ is contained in $\mathrm{R}(G)$ or 0 if such an integer does not exist. Then the maximum $\max\{n_g \,|\, g \in G\}$ is achieved at the identity element, and it is $n_e = |G|$. In this way we recover $|G|$ just from the ring $\mathrm{R}(G)$. □

# 2 Isocategorical groups and symmetries

We have already mentioned in the course of the introduction that the representation category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ of a finite group $G$, as a symmetric monoidal category, determines $G$ up to isomorphism. Let us be more precise now. Deligne [Del90] constructed a symmetric monoidal forgetful functor $F\colon \mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(K)$, showed that it is unique, and that the group $G$ is isomorphic to the group of monoidal automorphisms of $F$. The symmetric monoidal structure is crucial here. It is possible that $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(KG')$ will be equivalent as monoidal categories without the two groups $G$ and $G'$ being isomorphic. To state this in different words, it is possible that a representation category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ admits another symmetry for the monoidal structure which will come from a different group $G'$. Two groups $G$ and $G'$ are called *isocategorical* in case $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(KG')$ are equivalent as monoidal categories. In [EG01] Etingof and Gelaki constructed all examples of non-isomorphic isocategorical finite groups.

**Example 2.1.** It is shown in [GM] that the smallest examples of isocategorical groups have order 64. Of the 267 isomorphism classes of groups of that order, these are the two groups named $\Gamma_{26}a_2$ and $\Gamma_{26}a_3$ by Hall and Senior [HS64], or `SmallGroup(64,136)` and `SmallGroup(64,135)` in [GAP], respectively. They both have exponent 8 and representations rings of rank 16, but the ranks of their Burnside rings differ: They are 76 and 73, respectively. These

groups can also be distinguished by looking at their homology $\mathrm{H}_3(G;\mathbb{Z})$ or cohomology $\mathrm{H}^3(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$.

We now review the work [EG01] of Etingof and Gelaki that describes how all groups isocategorical to a given group $G$ can be constructed.

First of all, there is a presentation

$$1 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow 1$$

of the group $G$ as an extension of some group $Q$ by an abelian group $A$. Let us write $A^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}(A, K^\times)$ for the character group of the kernel. Let

$$\alpha\colon A^\vee \times A^\vee \longrightarrow K^\times$$

be a non-degenerate 2–cocycle for the character group. (This means that the twisted group algebra $K^\alpha A$ is isomorphic to a matrix algebra.) In addition, the cohomology class $[\alpha]$ is $Q$–invariant. It thus represents a class in $\mathrm{H}^2(\mathrm{A}^\vee;\mathrm{K}^\times)^{\mathrm{Q}}$. By $Q$–invariance, we have $[q(\alpha)] = [\alpha]$ for all $q$ in $Q$. Thus, we can choose, for each element $q$ in the quotient group $Q$, a 1–cochain $z(q)\colon A^\vee \to K^\times$ such that

$$\mathrm{d}z(q) = \frac{q(\alpha)}{\alpha}$$

in the standard cochain complex $\mathrm{C}^1(A^\vee; K^\times) \to \mathrm{C}^2(A^\vee; K^\times)$. We will work with one such chosen family $(\,z(q)\,|\,q \in Q\,)$ from now on.

We define, for all elements $p, q$ in $Q$,

$$b(p,q) = \frac{z(pq)}{z(p)p(z(q))}\colon A^\vee \to K^\times. \tag{2.1}$$

Such a function is a 1–cochain, and a direct calculation shows that the differential vanishes on it: $\mathrm{d}(b(p,q))(\varphi) = 1$ for all $\varphi \in A^\vee$, so that $b$ is a 1–cocycle, that is a character of $A^\vee$. In other words, the function $b$ assigns to any pair of elements in $Q$ an element in $(A^\vee)^\vee = A$. It turns out that $b$ is a 2–cocycle of $Q$, and we can think of it as having values in $A$, that is $b \in \mathrm{Z}^2(Q;A)$.

**Remark 2.2.** Notice that the map $\mathrm{H}^0(Q;\mathrm{H}^2(A^\vee;K^\times)) \to \mathrm{H}^2(Q;\mathrm{H}^1(A^\vee;K^\times))$ which sends $[\alpha]$ to $[b]$ also arises as the first differential on the second page of the Lyndon–Hochschild–Serre spectral sequence for the split extension

$$1 \longrightarrow A^\vee \longrightarrow A^\vee \rtimes Q \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow 1.$$

Now that we have described the cocycle $b$, we can use it to define an isocategorical group $G_b$. It has the same underlying set as the group $G$, but its multiplication $\cdot_b$ is defined by the rule

$$g \cdot_b h = b(\bar{g}, \bar{h})gh, \tag{2.2}$$

where $g \mapsto \bar{g}$ is the projection $G \to Q$.

**Theorem 2.3.** (Etingof–Gelaki [EG01, Theorem 1.3]) *Two finite groups $G$ and $G'$ are isocategorical if and only if the group $G'$ is isomorphic to a group of the form $G_b$ for some $b$, where the group $A$ has order $2^{2m}$ for some $m$.*

For the easier direction, note that a monoidal equivalence

$$F_b \colon \mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(KG_b) \tag{2.3}$$

between the representation categories is given in the following way: If $V$ is a $G$–representation, then $F_b(V) = V$ has the same underlying vector space, but the action of an element $g$ in $G_b$ is given as follows: If

$$V = \bigoplus_{\varphi \in A^\vee} V(\varphi)$$

is the isotypical decomposition of $V$ as an $A$–representation, then

$$g \cdot_b v = \frac{1}{z(\bar{g})(\bar{g}(\varphi))} gv \tag{2.4}$$

for the elements $v \in V(\varphi)$. For this monoidal equivalence $F_b$, a monoidal isomorphism $F_b(V \otimes W) \to F_b(V) \otimes F_b(W)$ is given by

$$v \otimes w \longmapsto \frac{1}{\alpha(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)} v \otimes w$$

where $v \in V(\varphi_1)$ and $w \in W(\varphi_2)$. For the rest of this paper, we will call a functor of the form $F_b$ an *Etingof–Gelaki equivalence*.

**Remark 2.4.** In order to have an equivalence, it is not necessary that $A$ is a 2–group. If $b'$ is the resulting cocycle from a different choice of the family $(z(q) \,|\, q \in Q)$, then $[b] = [b']$ and there exists a canonical isomorphism of groups $\rho \colon G_{b'} \cong G_b$. The functor $F_{b'}$ will then be isomorphic to the composition

$$\mathbf{Rep}(KG) \xrightarrow{F_b} \mathbf{Rep}(KG_b) \xrightarrow{\rho^*} \mathbf{Rep}(KG_{b'}).$$

In particular, if $b$ is trivial (which is always the case, for instance, when the order of $A$ is odd), we will get in this way an auto-equivalence of $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$. However, in case $A$ is non-trivial, the resulting auto-equivalence will be monoidal but not symmetric.

The induced symmetry on the category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ arising from conjugating the symmetry on $\mathbf{Rep}(KG_b)$ with the equivalence $\mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(KG_b)$ will be

$$v \otimes w \mapsto \frac{\alpha(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)}{\alpha(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)} w \otimes v.$$

Notice that even if $b$ is a trivial cocycle we might get a new non-trivial symmetry on the category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$.

In the next section, we will show that these are all possible symmetric monoidal structures that arise from equivalences between representation categories of finite groups. We shall also classify all monoidal auto-equivalences of them.

# 3 Symmetries and monoidal auto-equivalences

A *fusion category* over $K$ is a semi-simple rigid monoidal $K$–linear category with finitely many simple objects and finite-dimensional Hom spaces [ENO05]. A guiding example to keep in mind is the representation category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ of a finite group $G$. A *fiber functor* on a fusion category is a $K$–linear exact faithful monoidal functor $T\colon \mathcal{D} \to \mathbf{Rep}(K)$. (The target category $\mathbf{Rep}(K)$ is just the category of vector spaces over the ground field $K$.) The endomorphism algebra $\mathrm{End}_K(T)$ has a canonical structure of a Hopf algebra, and the functor $T$ induces an equivalence of monoidal categories between $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathrm{End}_K(T))$. This is what is known as *Tannaka reconstruction* for Hopf algebras.

If now $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ are two fusion categories, and $F\colon \mathcal{D}_1 \to \mathcal{D}_2$ is a monoidal functor between them, and $T\colon \mathcal{D}_2 \to \mathbf{Rep}(K)$ is a $K$–linear monoidal functor, then $F$ induces a Hopf algebra morphism $\mathrm{End}_K(T) \to \mathrm{End}_K(TF)$ and the following dia-

gram is commutative up to a natural equivalence:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{Rep}(\mathrm{End}(TF)) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Rep}(\mathrm{End}(T)) \end{array}$$

where the lower horizontal arrow is restriction of representations.

Let us specialize these considerations to the case where $H$ is a finite-dimensional semi-simple Hopf algebra over the field $K$, and where $T\colon \mathbf{Rep}(H) \to \mathbf{Rep}(K)$ is the forgetful functor. Then a monoidal auto-equivalence $L\colon \mathbf{Rep}(H) \to \mathbf{Rep}(H)$ is given by a pair $(T', \Phi)$, where the first entry $T'\colon \mathbf{Rep}(H) \to \mathbf{Rep}(K)$ is a $K$–linear monoidal functor (which will become the composition $TL$) and the second entry is an isomorphism $\Phi\colon H \cong \mathrm{End}_K(T')$ of Hopf algebras. One can show that $(T', \Phi)$ will define the identity auto-equivalence if and only if $T' \cong T$, and under this isomorphism it holds that $\Phi$ corresponds to an automorphism of $H$ which arises from conjugation by a group-like element.

Consider now the case where the Hopf algebra $H = KG$ is the group algebra of a finite group $G$. Following the works of Movshev [Mov93], and also of Ostrik [Ost03a, Ost03b], and of Natale [Nat03], we know that fiber functors $F\colon \mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(K)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with pairs of the form $(A, [\psi])$ where $A$ is a subgroup of $G$ and $[\psi] \in \mathrm{H}^2(A\,; K^\times)$ is a cohomology class of a non-degenerate 2–cocycle. Two pairs $(A_1, [\psi_1])$ and $(A_2, [\psi_2])$ define isomorphic functors if and only if they differ by conjugation in $G$. For instance, the pair $(1, [1])$ consisting of the trivial subgroup and the trivial 2–cocycle on it corresponds to the forgetful functor $\mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(K)$. Furthermore, the Hopf algebra that one receives from Tannaka reconstruction is again a group algebra if and only if the subgroup $A$ is abelian and normal, and the cohomology class of the 2–cocycle $\psi$ is invariant under the action of the group $G$.

In the case of abelian groups the cocycle $\psi$ amounts to a skew-symmetric pairing on $A$, given by

$$(a, b) \longmapsto \frac{\psi(a, b)}{\psi(b, a)}.$$

In case $\psi$ is non-degenerate, this gives us an isomorphism $S\colon A \cong A^\vee$. The 2–cocycle $(S^{-1})^*(\psi)$ is then exactly the 2–cocycle which appears in the Etingof–

Gelaki classification of isocategorical groups mentioned in the previous section. This discussion leads to the following results:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that $\sigma$ is a symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$. Assume also that the exterior powers $\Lambda^n V$ (defined using the symmetry) satisfy $\Lambda^n V = 0$ for every object $V$ and large enough $n$ (depending on $V$). Then there exists a normal abelian subgroup $A$ of $G$ and a $G/A$–invariant non-degenerate cohomology class of a 2–cocycle $\alpha\colon A^\vee \times A^\vee \to K^\times$ such that $\sigma$ is given by*

$$v \otimes w \longmapsto \frac{\alpha(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)}{\alpha(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)} w \otimes v,$$

*where $A$ acts on $v$ via the character $\varphi_1$ and on $w$ via the character $\varphi_2$.*

*Proof.* Assume first that $\sigma$ is a symmetric monoidal structure of the aforementioned form. By Deligne (see [Del90]) we know that there exists an equivalence of symmetric monoidal categories $(\mathbf{Rep}(KG), \sigma) \to (\mathbf{Rep}(KG'), \sigma')$ where $\sigma'$ is the regular symmetry on $\mathbf{Rep}(KG')$ for some finite group $G'$. By the above discussion and the classification of fiber functors on $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ we know that every monoidal equivalence between $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(KG')$ is an Etingof–Gelaki equivalence. This implies that the symmetric monoidal structure is of the above form. □

**Theorem 3.2.** *Any monoidal auto-equivalence $\mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ is given by a triple $(A, \alpha, \varphi)$ consisting of an abelian normal subgroup $A$ of $G$, a $G/A$–invariant non-degenerate 2–cocycle $\alpha$ on $A^\vee$ and an isomorphism $\varphi\colon G \to G_b$, where $b$ is the 2–cocycle from the Etingof–Gelaki construction. Moreover, two tuples $(A, \alpha, \varphi)$ and $(A', \alpha', \varphi')$ will define isomorphic equivalences if and only if $A = A'$, $\alpha = \alpha'$ and $\varphi$ differs from $\varphi'$ by conjugation with an element of the group $G$.*

*Proof.* The proof of this is similar to the one before. □

**Remark 3.3.** It is worth mentioning the connection between the group of monoidal auto-equivalences of the fusion category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ that appears here and the Brauer–Picard group $\mathrm{BrPic}(\mathbf{Rep}(KG))$ that has been introduced in [ENO10]. We have a natural homomorphism of groups

$$\Phi\colon \mathrm{Aut}_\otimes(\mathbf{Rep}(KG)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{BrPic}(\mathbf{Rep}(KG))$$

which sends an automorphism $\psi$ to the quasi-trivial bimodule $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)_\psi$. The kernel of this homomorphism contains all auto-equivalences that are given (up to isomorphism) by conjugation with an invertible object in the category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$. Since the category $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ is symmetric, the homomorphism $\Phi$ is in fact injective, and we can consider the group $\mathrm{Aut}_\otimes(\mathbf{Rep}(KG))$ as a subgroup of the Brauer–Picard group $\mathrm{BrPic}(\mathbf{Rep}(KG))$. The image of the homomorphism $\Phi$ is denoted by $\mathrm{Out}(\mathbf{Rep}(KG))$. An element in the Brauer–Picard group is given by a module category $\mathcal{M}$ over $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ together with an equivalence between $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ and the dual $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)_\mathcal{M}$. Equivalence classes of module categories over $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ for which the dual is equivalent to $\mathbf{Rep}(KG')$ for some group $G'$ are given by pairs $(A,\psi)$ where $A$ is an abelian normal subgroup, and $\psi$ is a 2–cocycle, not necessarily non-degenerate. We see that the image of $\Phi$ contains all the bimodule categories in which the cocycle $\psi$ is non-degenerate (and for which the resulting group is isomorphic to $G$). For a deeper study of the Brauer–Picard group of $\mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ we refer the reader to the paper [NR14].

# 4 Preservation of the odd Adams operations

The purpose of this section is to prove the following result.

**Theorem 4.1.** *If $G$ and $G'$ are two isocategorical groups, then there is a monoidal equivalence $\mathbf{Rep}(G) \simeq \mathbf{Rep}(G')$ between their representation categories such that the induced isomorphism $\mathrm{R}(G) \cong \mathrm{R}(G')$ between their representation rings preserves the Adams operations $\Psi^p$ for all odd $p$.*

Let us begin with the following statement.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Assume that we have a short exact sequence $1 \to A \to G \to Q \to 1$, a non-degenerate 2–cocycle $[\alpha] \in \mathrm{H}^2(A^\vee; K^\times)^Q$, and $b\colon Q \times Q \to A$ the resulting 2–cocycle from the Etingof–Gelaki construction. If $b'\colon Q \times Q \to A$ is the resulting 2–cocycle from a different choice of family $(z(q) \,|\, q \in Q)$, then for every integer $k$ the functor $F_b$ will preserve $\Psi^k$ if and only if the functor $F_{b'}$ will preserve $\Psi^k$.*

*Proof.* This follows directly from Remark 2.4 and the fact that symmetric monoidal equivalences $F\colon \mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(KG')$ preserve all Adams opera-

tions: The Adams operations are determined by the λ–ring structure, and this structure in turn is determined by the symmetric monoidal structure. □

We can (and will) therefore assume that we are dealing with an Etingof–Gelaki equivalence between the finite groups $G$ and $G_b$ which arises from a short exact sequence $1 \to A \to G \to Q \to 1$, a $Q$–invariant cohomology class $[\alpha]$ in $\mathrm{H}^2(A^\vee; K^\times)$, and a 2–cocycle $b$ as above. We also assume here that the group $A$ is a 2–group.

**Lemma 4.3.** *We can choose the functions $z(q)\colon A^\vee \to K^\times$ in such a way that we have $z(q)(\varphi) = 1$ whenever $q(\varphi) = \varphi$.*

*Proof.* For a given element $q \in Q$, pick any function $z(q)$ that satisfies the equation $\mathrm{d}z(q) = q(\alpha)/\alpha$. The restriction of $z(q)$ to the $q$–invariant subgroup $B(q) = (A^\vee)^q$ is then a character of the abelian group $B(q)$. Indeed, we calculate

$$\mathrm{d}(z(q)|_{B(q)}) = \frac{q(\alpha|_{B(q)})}{\alpha|_{B(q)}} = 1,$$

by invariance. Since the field $K$ is assumed to be algebraically closed, its group of units is divisible, so that any character on $B(q)$ can be extended to a character on $A^\vee$. By multiplying $z(q)$ with the inverse of the extended character, we do not change the 2–cocycle $\mathrm{d}z(q)$, but we assure that we have $z(q)|B(q) = 1$, as desired. □

From now on we assume that $z(q)(\varphi) = 1$ whenever $q(\varphi) = \varphi$. Under this assumption, we can prove the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.4.** *The isomorphism $\mathrm{R}(G) \cong \mathrm{R}(G_b)$ induced by $F_b$ is the identity.*

Since $G_b$ is equal to $G$ as a set, this formulation makes sense.

*Proof.* Let $V$ be a representation of the group $G$ with character $\chi$. Recall our notation $B(q) = (A^\vee)^q$ for elements $q$ in the quotient $Q = G/A$. When we look at the way that an element $g$ of $G$ permutes the isotypical summands $V(\varphi)$ of $V$,

the only places where we will get a contribution to the character are those $V(\varphi)$ which are stable under the action of $\bar{g}$. Therefore, we can write

$$\chi(g) = \sum_{\varphi \in B(\bar{g})} \mathrm{tr}(\, g \,|\, V(\varphi)\,).$$

Let $\chi_b$ be the character of the $G_b$–representation $F(V)$. We then have

$$\chi_b(g) = \sum_{\varphi \in B(\bar{g})} \frac{1}{z(\bar{g})(\bar{g}(\varphi))} \mathrm{tr}(\, g \,|\, V(\varphi)\,)$$

by the definition (2.4) of the new action on $V$ when restricted to the subspace $V(\varphi)$. Since we can assume, by Lemma 4.3, that we have $z(\bar{g})(\varphi) = 1$ whenever $\bar{g}$ fixes $\varphi$, we deduce $\chi = \chi_b$ as functions on $G = G_b$ and we are done. □

Now that we have an explicit model for an isomorphism between the representation rings $\mathrm{R}(G)$ and $\mathrm{R}(G_b)$, we can check that it respects the odd Adams operations:

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Let $k$ be an odd integer. We have $(\Psi^k\chi)(g) = \chi(g^k)$ by definition of the Adams operations and similarly for $\Psi^k\chi_b$. We already know that $\chi_b = \chi$ by the previous lemma, so that the only possible difference is in the power $g^k$ of $g$: It is calculated once in the group $G$ and once in the group $G_b$, respectively. We can assume that $k$ is a positive integer. When we calculate $g^k$ using the multiplication (2.2) in $G_b$, we find

$$b(\bar{g},\bar{g}) \cdot b(\bar{g}^2,\bar{g}) \cdot \ldots \cdot b(\bar{g}^{k-1},\bar{g}) \cdot g^k$$

in terms of $G$. If we use formula (2.1), we can cancel repeating terms, and we get

$$\frac{z(\bar{g}^k)}{z(\bar{g}) \cdot g(z(\bar{g})) \cdot \ldots \cdot g^{k-1}(z(\bar{g}))} \cdot g^k.$$

The fractional part here is an element of $A$, described as a character $A^\vee \to K^\times$, and to finish the proof it suffices to show that this element is the unit.

As in the proof of the previous lemma, we know that

$$\chi(g^k) = \sum_{\varphi \in B(\bar{g}^k)} \mathrm{tr}(\, g^k \,|\, V(\varphi)\,).$$

A similar expression holds for $\Psi^k(\chi_b)$. We thus need only to consider characters $\varphi$ which are fixed by $g^k$. By the assumption that we made (after Lemma 4.3) on the functions $z(q)$, we get $z(\bar{g}^k)(\varphi) = 1$ in the numerator since $\varphi \in A^\vee$ is fixed by $g^k$. In the denominator we get

$$z(\bar{g})(\varphi)z(\bar{g})(g(\varphi))\cdots z(\bar{g})(g^{k-1}(\varphi)). \tag{4.1}$$

Let us write $Z$ for the expression (4.1). We shall prove now that $Z = 1$. On the one hand, the order of $Z$ is $2^m$ for some $m$. This follows from the fact that $A$ is a 2–group and that all the values of $\alpha$ and of $z(q)$ can be chosen to have values which are $2^l$ roots of unity, for some $l$. (In case the group $A$ has odd order we can choose a representative of $[\alpha]$ which is $Q$–invariant as a function. It is then easy to prove that in this case all Adams operations are being preserved). On the other hand, we will show now that $Z^k = 1$. Since $k$ is odd, this will finish the proof.

To prove $Z^k = 1$, we first extend the 2–cocycle $\alpha$ in the following way: if $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots \varphi_k$ all lie in $A^\vee$, then we define

$$\alpha(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots, \varphi_k) = \alpha(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\alpha(\varphi_1\varphi_2, \varphi_3)\ldots\alpha(\varphi_1\varphi_2\cdots\varphi_{k-1}, \varphi_k).$$

In other words, if we think of the 2–cocycle $\alpha$ as realizing an extension

$$1 \longrightarrow K^\times \longrightarrow \Gamma \longrightarrow A^\vee \longrightarrow 1$$

then we have that $s(\varphi_1)\cdots s(\varphi_k) = \alpha(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k)s(\varphi_1\varphi_2\cdots\varphi_k)$ where the map $\varphi \mapsto s(\varphi)$ is a set-theoretical section of the projection $\Gamma \to A^\vee$.

We have the formula

$$\frac{z(\bar{g})(\varphi)z(\bar{g})(\psi)}{z(\bar{g})(\varphi\psi)} = \frac{\alpha(\varphi, \psi)}{\alpha(g(\varphi), g(\psi))}.$$

By using it repeatedly, we get

$$Z = \frac{\alpha(\varphi, g(\varphi), \ldots, g^{k-1}(\varphi))}{\alpha(g(\varphi), \ldots, g^{k-1}(\varphi), \varphi)}.$$

We have also used here the fact that $z(\bar{g})(\varphi g(\varphi)\cdots g^{k-1}(\varphi)) = 1$. This is because the character $\varphi g(\varphi)\cdots g^{k-1}(\varphi)$ is $g$–invariant, and by Lemma 4.3 we can assume that the value of $z(\bar{g})$ on it is 1.

For every $j = 1, \dots k-1$ we can also write

$$Z = z(\bar{g})(g^j(\varphi) \cdots z(\bar{g})(g^{j+k-1}(\varphi))).$$

By doing the same calculation again, we get

$$Z = \frac{\alpha(g^j(\varphi), \dots, g^{j+k-1}(\varphi))}{\alpha(g^{j+1}(\varphi), \dots, g^{j+k}(\varphi))}$$

for every $j$. We multiply all these expression for $Z$. They cancel each other, and we are left with $Z^k = 1$. This finishes the proof. □

# 5 Examples and remarks

The following examples illustrate the subtlety of the situation.

**Example 5.1.** Let $\mathrm{D}_8$ again denote the dihedral group of order 8. We will describe a non-symmetric monoidal auto-equivalence of $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathrm{D}_8)$ which does not preserve $\Psi^2$, We will use the following presentation:

$$\mathrm{D}_8 = \langle x, y, q \,|\, x^2 = y^2 = q^2 = 1, [x,y] = 1, [q,y] = 1, [q,x] = y \rangle.$$

The subgroup $A = \langle x, y \rangle$ is a normal subgroup isomorphic to the Klein group. Let us denote a dual pair of generators of $A^\vee$ by $\nu, \mu$. The group $\mathrm{H}^2(A^\vee; K^\times)$ has order 2. A generator is given by $\alpha(\nu^a\mu^b, \nu^c\mu^d) = (-1)^{bc}$. This cohomology class must be $G/A$–invariant. We choose $z(q)(\nu^a\mu^b) = \mathrm{i}^b$. We then get that $z$ satisfies the condition of Lemma 4.3. The resulting 2–cocycle $b$ is given by $b(q,q) = y$. Notice that $b$ is a trivial cocycle since in $G$ the equation $(qx)^2 = y$ holds and therefore the function $G \to G_b$ given by sending $x^i y^j q^k$ to $x^i y^{j+k} q^k$ is an isomorphism of groups. However, the resulting monoidal equivalence $\mathbf{Rep}(KG) \to \mathbf{Rep}(KG_b) \to \mathbf{Rep}(KG)$ is not symmetric and it does not preserve the second Adams operation. Indeed, the group $G$ has four 1-dimensional irreducible representations $V_{00}, V_{01}, V_{10}, V_{11}$ and a unique two dimensional irreducible representation $W$. The element $x^i y^j q^k$ acts on $V_{ab}$ by the scalar $(-1)^{ai+kb}$. A direct calculation shows that

$$\Psi^2(W) = V_{00} + V_{10} + V_{01} - V_{11}$$

while $F(W) = W$ and

$$F(\Psi^2(W)) = V_{00} - V_{10} + V_{01} + V_{11}$$

is different from $\Psi^2(F(W))$.

**Example 5.2.** There are examples of monoidal equivalences which preserve all Adams operations, but which are not symmetric. Indeed, there are Etingof–Gelaki equivalences that preserve all Adams operations without being symmetric. To see this, consider the case where the quotient $Q$ is trivial but the subgroup $A$ is not. The cocycle $b$ is then of course trivial, and the functor $F_b$ preserves trivially all the Adams operations. However, since the abelian subgroup $A$ is not trivial, $\alpha$ is not trivial, and the functor $F_b$ is not symmetric. The smallest such example is the Klein 4–group $\mathrm{C}_2 \times \mathrm{C}_2$. This group has four 1–dimensional irreducible representations, which we shall denote by $V_{ij}$ for $i, j \in \{0,1\}$. On the category $\mathbf{Rep}(K(\mathrm{C}_2 \times \mathrm{C}_2))$ we have two different symmetries. The regular symmetry $V_{ij} \otimes V_{kl} \cong V_{kl} \otimes V_{ij}$ is given by

$$x \otimes y \longmapsto y \otimes x,$$

and the second symmetry is given by

$$x \otimes y \longmapsto (-1)^{il+jk} y \otimes x.$$

However, with respect to both symmetries, the Adams operation $\Psi^k$ is the identity for every odd $k$, and $\Psi^k(V_{ij}) = V_{00}$ for every even $k$.

**Remark 5.3.** In all examples of monoidal equivalences $F\colon \mathbf{Rep}(G) \to \mathbf{Rep}(G')$ that preserve all Adams operations that we have seen so far, the groups $G$ and $G'$ are isomorphic. If $F$ is symmetric, then this is clear: an isomorphism is induced by the functor $F$, because the groups $G$ and $G'$ are isomorphic to the automorphism groups of the fiber functors. In the Examples 5.2, we have $G \cong G'$ by construction.

The preceding remark may be taken as evidence for an affirmative answer to the question in the introduction. Here is more that may be considered in support of it:

**Remark 5.4.** Let $G$ be a group with two $G$–representations $V$ and $W$. Using the notation of Section 2, for any isocategorical group $G_b$, we have two corresponding $G_b$–representations $V_b$ and $W_b$. A slight variation of the results of Section 1.2 allows us to deduce the following: For every permutation $\sigma$ in $\mathrm{S}_n$, we

have $\chi_U(\sigma) = \mathrm{tr}(\sigma\,|\,U) = \mathrm{tr}(\sigma\,|\,U_b) = \chi_{U_b}(\sigma)$ when we consider the action of $\sigma$ on the spaces $U = \mathrm{Hom}_G(V, W^{\otimes n})$ and $U_b = \mathrm{Hom}_{G_b}(V_b, W_b^{\otimes n})$. Since the permutation groups $\mathrm{S}_n$ are finite and the ground field is of characteristic zero, this already means that $U$ and $U_b$ are actually isomorphic as $\mathrm{S}_n$–representations.

# Acknowledgment

Both authors were supported by the Danish National Research Foundation through the Centre for Symmetry and Deformation (DNRF92). The first author was also supported by the Research Training Group 1670 "Mathematics Inspired by String Theory and Quantum Field Theory." The first author thanks Victor Ostrik for discussions. The second author thanks Björn Schuster for discussions.

# References

[Ben84] D.J. Benson. Lambda and psi operations on Green rings. J. Algebra 87 (1984) 360–367.

[Bre94] L. Breen. Tannakian categories. Motives (Seattle, WA, 1991) 33–376. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 55, Part 1. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.

[AT69] M.F. Atiyah, D.O. Tall. Group representations, λ–rings and the $J$–homomorphism. Topology 8 (1969) 253–297.

[Ber71] P. Berthelot. Généralités sur les λ–anneaux. Exposé V. Théorie des Intersections et Théorème de Riemann-Roch (SGA 6) 297–364. Lecture Notes in Mathematics Volume 225. Springer, 1971.

[Dad64] E.C. Dade. Answer to a question of R. Brauer. J. Algebra 1 (1964) 1–4.

[Del90] P. Deligne. Catégories tannakiennes. The Grothendieck Festschrift, Vol. II, 111–195. Progr. Math., 87. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990.

[DM82] P. Deligne, J. Milne. Tannakian categories. Hodge cycles, motives, and Shimura varieties, 101–228. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.

[EG01] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki. Isocategorical groups. Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2001) 59–76.

[ENO05] P.I. Etingof, D.A. Nikshych, V. Ostrik. On fusion categories. Ann. of Math. 162 (2005) 581–642.

[ENO10] P.I. Etingof, D.A. Nikshych, V. Ostrik. Fusion categories and homotopy theory. With an appendix by E. Meir. Quantum Topol. 1 (2010) 209–273.

[GAP] The GAP Group. GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming. www.gap-system.org

[GM] I. Goyvaerts, E. Meir. The Witt group of a braided monoidal category. arXiv:1412.3417

[Gro58] A. Grothendieck. La théorie des classes de Chern. Bull. Soc. Math. France 86 (1958) 137–154.

[HS64] M. Hall, J.K. Senior. The groups of order $2^n (n \leqslant 6)$. Collier–Macmillan, London, 1964.

[Hig40] G. Higman. The units of group-rings. Proc. London Math. Soc. 46 (1940) 231–248.

[KSZ06] Y. Kashina, Y. Sommerhäuser, Y. Zhu. On higher Frobenius–Schur indicators. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 181 (2006) 855.

[Knu73] D. Knutson. $\lambda$–rings and the representation theory of the symmetric group. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 308. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1973.

[Mov93] M.V. Movshev. Twisting in group algebras of finite groups. Funct. Anal. Appl. 27 (1993) 240–244.

[Nat03] S. Natale. On group theoretical Hopf algebras and exact factorizations of finite groups. J. Algebra 270 (2003) 199–211.

[NR14] D. Nikshych, B. Riepel. Categorical Lagrangian Grassmannians and Brauer–Picard groups of pointed fusion categories. J. Algebra 411 (2014) 191–214.

[Ost03a] V. Ostrik. Module categories, weak Hopf algebras and modular invariants. Transformation Groups 8 (2003) 177–206.

[Ost03b] V. Ostrik. Module categories over the Drinfeld double of a finite group. Int. Math. Res. Notices 27 (2003) 1507–1520.

[Pat03] F. Patras. Lambda-rings. Handbook of algebra, Vol. 3, 961–986, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003.

[Ser67] J.-P. Serre. Représentations linéaires des groupes finis. Hermann, Paris, 1967.

[Shi10] K. Shimizu. Monoidal Morita invariants for finite group algebras. J. Algebra 323 (2010) 397–418.

[Wil82] C. Wilkerson. Lambda-rings, binomial domains, and vector bundles over $CP(\infty)$. Comm. Algebra 10 (1982) 311–328.

[Yau10] D. Yau. Lambda-rings. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2010.

Ehud Meir
Department of Mathematics
University of Hamburg
22529 Hamburg
GERMANY
meirehud@gmail.com

Markus Szymik
Department of Mathematical Sciences
NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology
7491 Trondheim
NORWAY
markus.szymik@ntnu.no